

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about July 5, 1945, from La Valle, Wis., by the C. C. Garget Remedy Co.

PRODUCT: 10 bottles of *C. C. C. Formula* at Stillwater, Minn. Analysis showed that the product consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, oil of wintergreen, and not more than 7.5 percent of sulfanilamide.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following label statements were false and misleading since the article, when used as directed, would not be effective in the treatment of garget or mastitis of milch cows: "Tripple 'C' Formula has been successfully used by Thousands of Farmers who have Garget or Mastitis in their Milch Cows. 95% of cases Cleared up. * * * In severe cases where cow doesn't eat, drench with two tablespoonsful in pint of sweet milk three times daily, till cow gets back on feed. Treat at least ten days. In cases where udder is swollen before freshening, milk out twice daily and give remedy."

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Formula * * * Sulphanilamide," was misleading since it created the impression that the article, when used as directed, would supply a therapeutically useful dosage of sulfanilamide, whereas the article, when used as directed, would not supply a therapeutically useful dosage of sulfanilamide.

DISPOSITION: October 17, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the product be destroyed.

1846. Misbranding of Kennedy's Garget Remedy. U. S. v. 57 Packages of Kennedy's Garget Remedy. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17088. Sample No. 27283-H.)

LABEL FILED: August 7, 1945, District of Idaho.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 11, 1945, by R. O. Kennedy, trading as the Kennedy Remedy Co., from Grants Pass, Ore.

PRODUCT: 57 packages of *Kennedy's Garget Remedy* at Nampa, Idaho. Examination disclosed that each package contained 2 small packages, one containing potassium nitrate and the other containing a bottle of fluid-extract of phytolacca.

LABEL, IN PART: (Small packages) "Kennedy's Garget Remedy * * * Fluid Ext. Phytolacca," and "Potassium Nitrate * * * Garget Treatment."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements, "Garget Remedy For Stringy or Bloody Milk" and "Garget Treatment," were false and misleading since they suggested and implied that the articles alone or in combination would be effective to treat garget of cows. The articles, used either alone or in combination, would not be effective for such purpose.

DISPOSITION: December 14, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1847. Misbranding of Jaques' Poultry Preparation. U. S. v. 48 Bottles of Jaques' Poultry Preparation, and a number of circulars. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17125. Sample No. 18678-H.)

LABEL FILED: August 27, 1945, District of Minnesota.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 31, 1945, by the F. M. Jaques Co., from La Crosse, Wis.

PRODUCT: 31 1-quart bottles, 15 ½-gallon bottles, and 2 1-gallon bottles of *Jaques' Poultry Preparation*, at Red Wing, Minn., together with a number of circulars entitled "Information for Treating Poultry with Jaques Remedies."

Examination showed that the product consisted essentially of water, epsom salt, potassium dichromate, nitrates, and chlorites. It contained no potassium chlorate.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following statements were false and misleading since the article would be valueless when used as directed in the treatment of any disease of poultry: (Bottle label) "Jaques' Poultry Preparation is an intestinal astringent and has a very broad usage among Poultry raisers"; (circular) "Use Jaques' Poultry Preparation for all ages of fowl. For poultry out of condition and in need of a regulator and conditioner. * * * Jaques' Poultry Preparation acts as a mild bowel stimulant, a mild acting laxative and astringent. Both chicks and older fowls like Jaques' Poultry Preparation and will drink up to 25 per cent more water when the remedy is used. * * * Bowel Trouble In Older Fowls * * * For Moulting Fowls * * * For Layers And Breeders * * * Jaques'

Poultry Preparation has a broad usage among poultry raisers and is guaranteed to give satisfaction, and according to our records it has satisfied over 99% of the poultry raisers who have used it."

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Active Ingredients * * * Potassium Chlorate," was false and misleading since the article contained no potassium chlorate.

DISPOSITION: October 17, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the product and circulars be destroyed.

1848. Misbranding of Jaques' Inhalant Spray, Jaques' BCR, and Jaques' Worm Powder. U. S. v. 13 Bottles of Jaques' Inhalant Spray, 13 Bottles of Jaques' BCR, and 2 Cans of Jaques' Worm Powder, together with a number of circulars. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17126. Sample Nos. 19188-H to 19190-H, incl.)

LABEL FILED: August 25, 1945, District of Minnesota.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 28, 1945, by the F. M. Jaques Co., from La Crosse, Wis.

PRODUCT: 13 1-quart bottles of *Jaques' Inhalant Spray*, 13 1-quart bottles of *Jaques' BCR*, and 2 7-ounce cans of *Jaques' Worm Powder*, at Rushford, Minn., together with a quantity of circulars entitled "Information for Treating Poultry with Jaques Remedies."

Examination disclosed that the *Worm Powder* consisted essentially of plant material, including Kamala and tobacco, but that it did not contain nux vomica; that the *Jaques' BCR* consisted essentially of water, potassium dichromate, potassium chlorate, a tarry material such as beechwood creosote or guaiacol, and a small amount of volatile oils, including oil of camphor; and that the *Jaques' Inhalant Spray* consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, glycerin, and volatile oils, including oil of camphor.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Jaques' Worm Powder*. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article contained nux vomica as one of its active ingredients; and that the article would be effective in the treatment of roundworms and ascarids in poultry. The article contained no nux vomica, and it would not be effective in the treatment of roundworms and ascarids in poultry.

Jaques' BCR. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article, alone or in combination with *Jaques' Inhalant Spray*, would be effective in the treatment of respiratory diseases of poultry. The article, alone or in combination with *Jaques' Inhalant Spray*, would not be effective for such purposes.

Jaques' Inhalant Spray. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective in the treatment of respiratory diseases of poultry; and that it would be effective in the treatment of coughs in hogs and in the prevention of respiratory diseases of baby chicks. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

DISPOSITION: November 2, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the products and circulars be destroyed.

1849. Adulteration and misbranding of Nico Sulpho Tablets. U. S. v. 178 Dozen Packages of Nico Sulpho Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17299. Sample No. 22978-H.)

LABEL FILED: August 27, 1945, Western District of Tennessee.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 30, 1945, from Winona, Minn., by the J. R. Watkins Co.

PRODUCT: 178 dozen 200-tablet packages of *Nico Sulpho Tablets* at Memphis, Tenn.

Examination showed that the product contained 0.79 grain of nicotine sulfate per tablet, a deviation of 21 percent from the declared strength.

LABEL, IN PART: "Nico Sulpho Tablets * * * Active Ingredient Nicotine Sulfate (1 grain per tablet)."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess since it did not contain 1 grain of nicotine sulfate per tablet.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following label statements were misleading since the article, when used as directed, would not be effective to produce the